## REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the present response, claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 30 are independent. Claims 2-13, 18-29, 46 and 47 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 31-33, 35-39 and 41-45 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 30, as amended. Applicants submit that pending claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

## INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner objects to reference C84 submitted via the Sixth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) dated July 17, 2009, contending that the submitted copy of the reference is not legible. Applicants hereby submit a new copy of the reference in the Seventh Supplemental IDS filed herewith. Applicants submit that the new copy is legible and that the Seventh Supplemental is filed in compliance with rules § 1.56, § 1.97 and § 1.98. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to consider the listed references.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

I. <u>Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-33, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103</u>

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-33, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0004950 to Wils et al. ("Wils") in

view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0073512 to Shrader et al. ("Shrader"). claims 1, 9 and 43 are independent claims. Claims 2-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-29 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 31-33, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 31. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that Wils and Shrader, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-33, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47.

A.       Independent Claims 1 and 30 Patentably Distinguished over Wils and Shrader

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Independent claims 1 and 30 recite a collection agent gathering information about the client node in response to a request to access a resource. These claims further recite making an access control decision for the requested resource and identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect. The application session is identified from one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user. Therefore, the claims explicitly indicate that the application session is identified <u>after</u> making the access control decision. Applicants submit that Wils and Shrader, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 30.

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that the subscriber key of Wils is verified to limit access to registered subscribers and that subsequent to the access decision, a session determination step provides "a second level of security". According to FIG. 2 of Wils, however, the flow chart clearly indicates that session determination (step 200) occurs <u>before</u> subscriber

key verification (step 212), thereby mooting the Examiner's argument.  Therefore, Applicants respectfully disagrees that Wils teaches identifying an associated session <u>after</u> making an access control session.  In further details, Wils describes a first level of security provided by a routine that begins with session identification at step 200 of the flow chart. (See also paragraphs [0048] and [0053]-[0054]; network security level and network access routine; "routine first checks the *session database* ... routine determines whether the request is part of an ongoing *session*".)  The second level of security is handled by a second routine at step 218, further along in the flow chart.  (See also paragraph [0063]; resource security level and resource *access control* routine.) Therefore, Wils clearly identifies a session at steps 200-202 followed by access control at steps 218-220.  Subscriber key verification (step 212) does not even occur if an existing session is identified.  Therefore, in this scenario, Wils clearly fails to teach or suggest identifying an associated session <u>after</u> making an access control decision, and, certainly, not from one or more application sessions disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user.

In a second scenario, the subscriber key of Wils is verified at step 212 *if* <u>no sessions</u> are identified (see paragraph [0048], indicating that the subscriber key is used as the index into the subscriber network identification table of step 212).  Wils proceeds to create a new session at step 216 (see also the last sentence of paragraph [0060]).  However, creating a new session is clearly <u>not</u> the same as identifying a session from one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from a client node previously operated by the user. Therefore, even in the second scenario, Wils fails to teach or suggest identifying an application session, from one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user, after making an access control decision.

In addition, the Examiner admits that Wils fails to disclose a collection agent gathering information about the client node. For this, the Examiner relies on a client-side script feature of Shrader. This feature is embedded in a test page which is loaded onto a user's web browser for testing a security plugin of a web server (see col. 1, lines 37-41, col. 2, lines 50-52). However, rather than gathering information about the *client node*, the test page merely gathers *user* login information, i.e., userid and password (see col. 3, lines 53-55), and reloads a document from the *web server* (see col. 3, lines 37-43). Therefore, as with Wils, Shrader fails to teach or suggest a collection agent gathering information about the client node. Moreover, Shrader does not teach or suggest the feature of identifying an application session after making an access control decision. Therefore, the combination of Wils and Shrader fails to teach or suggest at least these features of claims 1 and 30.

For these reasons, Wils and Shrader, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 30. Applicants therefore submit that independent claims 1 and 30, and dependent claims 2-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28, 29, 31-33, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-33, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

II. <u>Dependent Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103</u>

Dependent claims 8, 25, 35 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wils and Shrader in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0073512 to Maung et al. ("Maung"). Dependent claims 10, 27 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wils and Shrader in view of the Examiner's Official Notice. Claims 8, 10, 25 and 27 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1.

Claims 35, 37 and 41 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 30. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that Wils, Shrader and Maung, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 8, 10, 25, 27, 35, 37 and 41.

### A.   Claims 8, 10, 25, 27, 35, 37 and 41 Patentable over Wils, Shrader and Maung

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. As discussed above in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 30, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 30 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

The Examiner cites Maung only for a session storage feature. However, as with Wils and Shrader, Maung fails to teach or suggest identifying an application session after making an access control decision and a collection agent gathering information about a client node. Furthermore, in the rejection of claims 10, 27 and 37, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the application to provide the subscriber of Wils with a user interface to select a requested server. Applicants submit that the combination of the cited references with the selection of a requested server using a user interface still fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 30. Accordingly, neither Maung nor the Official Notice detracts from the patentability of claims 1 and 30.

For these reasons, Applicants submit that Wils, Shrader, Maung and the Official Notice, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 30. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 30, and dependent claims 8, 10, 25, 27,

35, 37 and 41, are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request

the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 10, 25, 27, 35, 37 and 41 under U.S.C. §103.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's

rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for

allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all

grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants'

attorney at the telephone number identified below.


Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: <u>December 10, 2009</u>　　　　　　*/John D. Lanza/*
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　John D. Lanza
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Registration No. 40,060
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Attorney for Applicants

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Two International Place
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Boston, MA 02110
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(617) 248-5000